

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-11 are pending and claims 1-11 stand rejected. In the amendment claims 1, 8 and 10 are amended and claim 2 is cancelled. In response to the office action dated August 27, 2007, the claim amendments and following comments are submitted and reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

Specification

The Abstract is objected to for containing legal phraseology and not describing the invention in a narrative manner. The Abstract has been duly amended to meet the requirements set forth in MPEP §608.01b.

35 U.S.C. §112 6th paragraph

Claim 1 is objected to for not using a proper “means plus function” form. Claim 1 has been amended to replace “means enabling to establish...” with “means for establishing...”. Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claim 1.

37 C.F.R. 1.75(c)

Claim 4 is objected to as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The elements that were previously contained in both claims 1 and 4,

“means for updating signalization tables comprised in the incoming data, and means for inserting the modified signalization tables in the stream sent to the local area network”

have been deleted from claim 1. Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claim 4.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horie et al. (US 6,968,376), and further in view of Baird et al (US 6,073,176) and Kubota et al (US 6,353,613).

Amended claim 1 recites a communication device comprising :

- several external data sources,
- at least a local area network connecting peripherals,
- a plurality of means for establishing connections between the local area network and the external data sources upon request of at least one peripheral,
- means for controlling the incoming data from the external sources according to said request of at least one peripheral and for sending them to the local area network in order to reduce the bandwidth occupation on the local area network,

wherein said means for controlling the incoming data discards the data not requested by said at least one peripheral, in order to reduce the bandwidth occupation on the local area network.

In Horie, it is not described that there are means for controlling the incoming data. Therefore, moreover it is not described that the peripherals located on the local area network request data from the external sources and that only the data that are requested by the peripherals of the external network are kept in the data stream in order to limit the bandwidth occupation on the local area network.

Baird described a firewall. A firewall, as explained in Baird on column 1 lines 30-37, prevents unauthorized external access into the private network. Therefore a firewall has not the same meaning as the means for controlling the incoming data of Applicants' claim 1 which discards the data not requested by said at least one peripheral, in order to reduce the bandwidth occupation on the local area network.

Kubota describes a method where two streams are multiplexed and in order to avoid packets having the same PIDs in both streams, thus not being able to be recognized at the receiving side, a new identifier is added to the packets, so their belonging to one of the streams can be established at reception thanks to

this identifier. Therefore, Kubota does not describe at all amended claim 1 as it does not describe also a communication device according to claim 1 because Kubota does not describe a peripheral connected to a local area network and control means for controlling the incoming data and discarding the data not requested by one peripheral, in order to reduce the bandwidth occupation on the local area network.

As none of the Horie, Baindur or Kubota references reveal nor suggest all the elements of amended claim 1, Applicants sincerely believe the rejection of claim 1 is traversed. Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Dependent claims 3-8 depend directly from independent claim 1 or other dependent claims dependent on claim 1 and recite additional features therefore. As such and for at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicants submit that dependent claims 3-8 are also neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited documents.

Therefore the Applicants submit that dependent claims 3-8 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are patentable thereunder.

Claim 10 is a method claim corresponding to the device of claim 1. Amendment of claim 10 parallels that of claim 1 and is thus patentable for all the same reasons stated previously for patentability of claim 1.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horie et al. (US 6,968,376), and further in view of Baindur et al (US 6,073,176) and Kubota et al (US 6,353,613) and Karol et al (US Pat 6,628,617). Claim 9 is a claim reciting, *inter alia*,

"System comprising :

... A gateway ... wherein each gateway module is a communication device according to claim 1."

As discussed previously, Applicant believes rejection of claim 1 has been traversed. Since claim 9 recites to include claim 1, claim 9 is also allowable for the

additional features it presents. Withdrawal of rejection of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (317) 587-4029, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No additional fee is believed due. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,



By: William A. Lagoni
Reg. No. 47,730
Phone (317) 587-4029

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
January 22, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

1/22/08
Date



William A. Lagoni